

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figs. 1-4 are, as per the Examiner's request, replaced with copies of the figures submitted with the Certified Copy of the Foreign Priority Application.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 remain pending in the application.

In the Drawings

The drawings have been replaced as per the Examiner's request. Favorable consideration is requested.

In the Specification

The specification has been amended in accordance with the requirements advanced by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. A marked up copy which shows the amendments that are faithfully incorporated into the Substitute Specification which is submitted with this response, accompanies this submission.

Claim Amendments

The claims have been amended to overcome the issues raised in paragraph 6 of this Office Action.

Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The rejection of claims 5-6 and 8-10 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, is, in light of the amendments made to the claims *supra*, is respectfully traversed. In this response, the use of the objectionable trademark is removed. This, in combination with the other changes, is seen as obviating the issues relating to this rejection.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 1-4 and 7 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by "Essential Rhapsody in C++" version 4.1, published January 1, 2003 (art made of record, hereafter "Rhapsody4.1").

Rhapsody4.1 is discussed in the text of present specification (page 2, line 8 to last line). To sum up, in order to be able to perform requirement traceability with an UML model, one must obviously attach a requirement to an element of this model. When using Rhapsody, this

attachment is performed in the way explained with reference to our Fig. 2, i.e. by using the "Add New / Constraint" function. Now, in the reference, the details of the "Add New" function appear only on page E1-10, and they do not comprise any constraint function (such as that in our figure 2). Therefore, this reference is of no use at all in connection with teaching requirement traceability. All other pages of the reference fail to mention any requirement and the Examiner's analysis in relation with objections to claim 1 (page 5, down from line 1) seems to be in error.

Anyhow, even when studying the full Rhapsody user manual (or any other I-Logix document), one can not find therein any suggestion for performing a traceability like the one performed according to the claimed/disclosed invention. As a matter of fact, the reference teaches only basics of UML modelling.

Our method mainly consists in putting two requirements: one "downstream" requirement that is tied to each element that is being created, and one "upstream" ("upward") requirement that is tied to the source of the thus created element.

Reconsideration in light of the above, is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 5-6 and 8-10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhapsody4.1 in view of "Visual Requirements-Driven Development with UML 2.0" to Cris Kobryn (art made of record, hereafter "Kobryn"), is respectfully traversed.

The Kobryn reference discloses the basics regarding the use of the DOORS tool (it was discussed in present application, page 2). It indeed mentions requirements and traceability, but does not suggest any solution for performing the same.

The Applicants submit that it would not be self-evident to combine Rhapsody 4.1 and Kobryn, e.g. since (as indicated *supra*) Rhapsody 4.1 does not mention any requirement and does not mention in its "Add New" function, any constraint.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: April 2, 2009
KMB/KJT/cac